1		Honorable James L. Robar	
2		nonorable James L. Roban	
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE		
9		1	
10	PACIFIC MARKET, INC., A WASHINGTON CORPORATION, d/b/a PACIFIC MARKET INTERNATIONAL,	No. CV03-1261-JLR	
11	Plaintiff,	ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT	
12	٧.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
13	THERMOS L.L.C., a Delaware limited		
14	liability company,		
15	Defendant.		
16		I	
17	Defendant Thermos L.L.C. ("Thermos"), answers the Second Amended Complaint as		
18	follows:		
19	ANSV	<u>WER</u>	
20	1. Thermos is without sufficient in	formation or belief to form an answer to the	
21	allegations of paragraph 1 of the Second Amended Complaint and therefore denies each such		
22	allegation		
23	2. Thermos admits the allegations of paragraph 2 of the Second Amended		
24	Complaint.		
25			
26			
	ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED		
	COMPLAINT - 1 CV03-1261 JLR	PRESTON GATES & ELLIS LLP	
1	R	925 FOURTH AVENUE SUITE 2900	

925 FOURTH AVENUE SUITE 2900 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-1158 TELEPHONE: (206) 623-7580 FACSIMILE: (206) 623-7022

- 3. Thermos admits that the Second Amended Complaint alleges causes of action under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) and Washington State Consumer Protection Act R.C.W. 19.86.020 et seq. and common law. Thermos further admits that this Court has jurisdiction of the federal claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338(a) and (b) and supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). Thermos denies each and every remaining allegation of paragraph 3 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 4. Thermos admits that venue in this action is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1791(b)(1). Thermos denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 4 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 5. Thermos is without sufficient information or belief to form an answer to the allegations of paragraph 5 of the Second Amended Complaint and therefore denies each such allegation.
- 6. Thermos is without sufficient information or belief to form an answer to the allegations of paragraph 6 of the Second Amended Complaint and therefore denies each such allegation.
- 7. Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 7 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 8. Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 8 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 9. Thermos admits the allegations of paragraph 9 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 10. Thermos admits that, since at least as early as September, 2002, Thermos has offered to sell insulated bottles to wholesale distributors and to retailers, including Target Stores, for resale. Thermos denies that the bottles shown in Exhibits C and D of the Second Amended Complaint accurately depict the appearance of bottles that it has offered to sell because neither of these exhibits show the trademark label that is prominently affixed to the

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - 2 CV03-1261 JLR

side wall of the bottles that Thermos has offered for sale. Thermos is without sufficient information or belief to form an answer to the remaining allegations of paragraph 10 of the Second Amended Complaint and therefore denies each such remaining allegation.

- Thermos admits that, since at least as early as September, 2002, Thermos has sold insulated bottles in this Judicial District. Thermos denies that the bottles shown in Exhibits C and D of the Second Amended Complaint accurately depict the appearance of bottles that it has sold because neither of these exhibits show the trademark label that is prominently affixed to the side wall of the bottles sold by Thermos. Thermos further denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 11 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 12. Thermos is without sufficient information or belief to form an answer to the allegation regarding the wholesale price of Stanley's products and therefore denies such allegation in paragraph 12 of the Second Amended Complaint. Thermos denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 12 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 13. Thermos realleges and incorporate by reference each response contained in paragraphs 1-12 of its answer as if fully set forth herein in response to the allegations of paragraph 13 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 14. Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 14 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 15. Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 15 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 16. Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 16 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 17. Thermos realleges and incorporates by reference each response contained in paragraphs 1-16 of its answer as if fully set forth herein in response to the allegations of paragraph 17 of the Second Amended Complaint.

1	18.	Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 18 of the Second Amended
2	Complaint.	
3	19.	Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 19 of the Second Amended
4	Complaint.	
5	20.	Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 20 of the Second Amended
6	Complaint.	
7	21.	Thermos realleges and incorporates by reference each response contained in
8	paragraphs 1-20 of its answer as if fully set forth herein in response to the allegations of	
9	paragraph 21 of the Second Amended Complaint.	
10	22.	Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 22 of the Second Amended
11	Complaint.	
12	23.	Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 23 of the Second Amended
13	Complaint.	
14	24.	Thermos denies the allegations of paragraph 24 of the Second Amended
15	Complaint.	
16		<u>DEFENSES</u>
17	1.	The shape and overall look of the Stanley vacuum insulated bottles shown in
18	Exhibits A and B to the Second Amended Complaint is non-distinctive.	
19	2.	The shape and overall look of the Stanley vacuum insulated bottles shown in
20	Exhibits A and B to the Second Amended Complaint is generic.	
21	3.	The shape and overall look of the Stanley vacuum insulated bottles shown in
22	Exhibits A and B to the Second Amended Complaint is functional.	
23	4.	Thermos prominently labels the insulated bottles shown in Exhibits C and D to
24	the Second Amended Complaint with Thermos' distinctive trademarks and therefore,	
25	Thermos has not palmed off its insulated bottles as those of Plaintiffs. Further, the use of	
26	Thermos' dis	tinctive trademarks precludes any likelihood of confusion.
	ANSWER TO S COMPLAINT - CV03-1261 JLI	

- 5. In the alternative, the appearance of Thermos' insulated bottles shown in Exhibits C and D to the Second Amended Complaint is distinctive and, as such, there is no likelihood of confusion.
- 6. In the alternative, and on information and belief, the designs and appearances of Exhibits C and D are the property of Thermos.
- 7. In the alternative, and on information and belief, Plaintiffs and their predecessors in interest abandoned any trade dress rights in the appearance of the insulated bottles shown in Exhibits A and B do the Second Amended Complaint prior to the filing of this action.
- 8. Counts I, II and III of the Second Amended Complaint are preempted by the United States Patent Laws and the Intellectual Property Clause of the United States Constitution Art I, 8, cl 8.
- 9. In the alternative, and on information and belief, the claims alleged in the Second Amended Complaint are barred by the doctrine of laches.
- 10. In the alternative, and on information and belief, the claims alleged in the Second Amended Complaint are barred by the doctrine of estoppel.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Thermos prays for the entry of judgment by this Court against Plaintiffs as follows:

- (a) Dismissing the Second Amended Complaint with prejudice;
- (b) Plaintiffs' requests for an award of damages, costs, attorney fees and injunctive relief be denied.
- (c) A finding that Thermos has not violated the Washington State Consumer Protection Act R.C.W. 19.86.020 et seq., and has not palmed off its goods as those of Plaintiffs in violation of common law unfair competition
  - (d) A finding that Thermos has not violated § 43(a) of the Lanham Act;

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT - 5 CV03-1261 JLR

## 

1	(e)	An award of Thermos' costs and actual and reasonable attorneys' fees; and		
2	(f)	Such other relief as this Court deems appropriate.		
3	DATE	DATED this 12th day of January, 2005.		
4				
5		PRESTON GATES & ELLIS LLP		
6				
7		By Marc C. Levy, wsba #19203		
8 9		Attorneys for Defendant Thermos L.L.C.		
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
The same of the sa	ANSWER TO SECOMPLAINT - CV03-1261 JLR			

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I hereby certify that on January 12, 2005, I filed the foregoing ANSWER TO 2 3 SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT – JURY TRIAL DEMANDED with the Clerk of 4 the Court, using the CM/ECF system which will send electronic notification of such filing to 5 the following: 6 David H. Binney: daveb@prestongates.com 7 Becky V. Christensen: bvc@ocmiplaw.com 8 Mark S. Carlson: carlson.mark@dorsey.com, otis.nicole@dorsey.com 9 10 Peter Scott Ehrlichman: ehrlichman.peter@dorsey.com 11 Michael J. Folise: mfolise@blacklaw.com 12 William E. Levin: wel@levin-oconnor.com 1.3 Marc C. Levy: <u>marcl@prestongates.com</u> 14 Shannon Marie McMinimee: mcminimee.shannon@dorsey.com 15 Edward F. O'Connor: efo@ocmiplaw.com 16 Jason M. Rhodes: Rhodes. Jason@dorsey.com 17 18 E. Russell Tarleton: rust@seedlaw.com 19 20 21 Wendy J. Lealy Legal Assistant PRESTON GATES & ELLIS LLP 22 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98104-1158 23 Phone: (206) 623-7580 Fax: (206) 623-7022 24 Email: leaw@prestongates.com 25 26